

### **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are requested.

By this amendment, claims 6-13 have been canceled and new claims 14-28 have been added. Thus, claims 14-28 are pending.

Claim 6 was objected to because of a limitation drawn to the thickness of the dielectric layer. This limitation has been removed from the claims, (without disclaimer of the subject matter). Accordingly, the objection is not applicable to the new claims.

Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. The language at issue was the limitation in claim 8 of “a resistance value of said float electrode in a direction in which the two parallel-disposed electrodes face each other is not less than a resistance value of said float electrode in a direction parallel to said display electrode.” This subject matter is now recited in independent claim 19 in the limitation “a resistance of each transparent float electrode is higher in areas of the float electrode that are closer to said parallel-disposed electrodes.” Please note that as pointed out by the Examiner, the specification (page 8, lines 10-12), discloses that the resistance of the float electrode “increases in a direction where float electrode 41 crosses display electrodes at right angles.” As recognized by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, this language is used in the specification to establish the direction in which the resistance increases, and not to literally state that the float electrode “crosses” the display electrodes. In order to avoid confusion, claim 19 has been drafted to simply recite this feature by stating that the resistance of each transparent float electrode is higher in areas of the float electrode that are closer to said parallel-disposed electrodes.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is not applicable to new claims 19-23 (or any of the pending claims).

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amemiya. However, for claim 7, which recited a transparent float electrode, the Examiner also included a secondary reference Kasahara. Since each of independent claims 14, 19, and 24 now recites a transparent float electrode, the rejection based only on the Amemiya reference does not apply to claims 14-28.

As mentioned above, Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amemiya in view of Kasahara. This rejection is traversed and is inapplicable to new claims 14-28 for the following reasons.

Each of independent claims 14, 19, and 24 recites that the “float electrodes are electrically insulated from said display electrode in every cell of the display panel” and that “the float electrode in each cell is separated from the float electrode in the other cells.” Please see page 8, lines 2-5 of the specification, which discloses that the float electrode is electrically insulated from the display electrodes, and Figs. 5 and 6, which disclose that the float electrode 41 is separated from the float electrodes in the other cells.

The Examiner relies on the secondary reference Kasahara as teaching a transparent electrode 17. However, as is clear from Fig. 1 (and discussed in paragraph [0010]), the transparent float electrode 17 of Kasahara is structurally continuous across the cells. Thus, the float electrode of Kasahara is not separated from the float electrodes of other cells as recited in claims 14, 19, and 24, and disclosed in Figs. 5 and 6 of the present application. Accordingly, no obvious combination of the teachings of Amemiya and Kasahara would result in the display panels recited in claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that claims 14-28 are allowable over the prior art of record and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Haruhiro YUKI et al.

By: 

Jeffrey R. Filipek

Registration No. 41,471

Attorney for Applicants

JRF/fs  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
January 10, 2006